

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 18, 21, 32, 33, 35, 36, 52, 53, 55, 58, 65-78 and 86-99 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 4, 65, 72, 86 and 93 being independent. Claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 20, 22-31, 34, 37-51, 54, 56, 57, 59-64 and 79-85 have been canceled, claims 1, 4, 65, 71, 72 and 78 have been amended, and claims 86-99 have been added.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 14 and 73 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Independent claims 1 and 65 and their dependent claims 11, 18, 32, 35, 52, 55 and 66-71 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Karr. Each of independent claims 1 and 65 has been amended to state that slit lines of the diffraction grating pattern are formed so as to be perpendicular to the photomask or the reticle, as shown in Fig. 1B and discussed at page 23, lines 9-12 of the specification. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of these amendments. In particular, neither Yamazaki nor Karr describes or suggests the arrangement of slit lines recited in amended claims 1 and 65.

Claims 4 and 72 and their dependent claims 21, 33, 36, 53, 58 and 74-78 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Karr and Tabata. Each of independent claims 4 and 72 has been amended to state that a translucent film is adjacent to the photomask or the reticle, as shown by the translucent portion of Fig. 1D that is discussed at page 23, line 24 to page 24, line 4 of the specification. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of these amendments. In particular, neither Yamazaki, Karr nor Tabata describes or suggests a translucent film such as is recited in claims 4 and 72. While the Examiner indicates that Tabata describes the use of a translucent mask such as silicon nitride for conventional chrome masks in photoresist applications, Tabata does not describe or suggest locating such a translucent mask adjacent to the photomask or the reticle, as recited in claims 4 and 72.

Like claims 1 and 65, independent claim 86 recites a diffraction grating pattern having slit lines that are formed so as to be perpendicular to the photomask or the reticle. Similarly, independent claim 93, like claims 4 and 72, recites a translucent film that is adjacent to the

Applicant : Hideto Ohnuma et al.
Serial No. : 09/925,512
Filed : August 10, 2001
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-068001 / US5147/5193

photomask or the reticle. Accordingly, these claims and their dependent claims are allowable for the reasons presented above.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$110 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 1, 2004



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40227938.doc